

Office of the Director
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-7795
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

Planning Division
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)
Urban Design Manager
(614) 645-8404
djthomas@columbus.gov

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

77 N. Front Street, STAT Room (Lower Level)

- I. Attendance** 0:44
- Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Otto Beatty, Jr.; Tedd Hardesty; Kyle Katz; Mike Lusk; Jana Maniace; Danni Palmore
- Absent: Michael Brown; Robert Loversidge
- City Staff: Daniel Thomas; Ashley Senn; Dan Blechschmidt; Daniel Moorhead
- II. Approval of the September 26, 2017 Downtown Commission Meeting Results**
- Motion to approve (7-0)
- III. Recommendation for Deviation (Waiver) to Streetscape Standards** 02:27

Case #1 17-10-3

Location: 387 E. Rich St.

Applicant: The Daimler Group – Todd Sloan

Design Professionals: Mode Architects

Faris Planning & Design – Land Planning, Landscape Arch.
EMH&T – Civil Engineers

Property Owner: Franklin Health Corp. (OhioHealth Corp. Real Estate)

Request:

Recommendation by Downtown Commission for deviation (waiver) of the Downtown Streetscape Standards.

The garage project was approved by the Downtown Commission at their August 22, 2017 meeting. Since that time a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) for the building permit and a CoA for site compliance have been issued.

The Downtown Streetscape Standards (p. 50, 51) allow for deviation from the standards and “require Downtown Commission review which will include a non-binding recommendation to the Department of Public Service.”

Discussion: City Council approved the Streetscape standards almost two years ago and they have been followed in an emerging number of locations. What was approved by the Commission in August was shown. New trees along Rich in a tree lawn. No improvements along Grant. Example of full borne standards shown. Area context shown, including Grant Hospital’s motif.

Locations where deviations or potential deviations were shown. SW – questions about tree lawn area and the ability to vary. TH - Standards do have a section that references areas such as these, particularly the eastern part of downtown as a transition area to more residential. Tree lawns are also the healthiest street tree planting environment. TS – reiterated the plan, especially the reserve park area along Grant Ave. There is a probability that the park area will be developed for a OhioHealth use in the future. The current sidewalk along Grant will not be impacted and there is no parking along this segment (which forms the derivation) of streetscape elements. We'll approach this when we come back for redevelopment of the park area. The Grant Ave. sidewalk is currently 10'. The area is really changing, possibly residential, but Ohio Health is more interested in medical or medical office. The existing tree lawn (10' wide) along Rich will remain but new trees will be added. Curb cuts will be added for access to garage. The sidewalk (8' wide) will be rebuilt and moved adjacent to the building. Existing on street parking will be removed to promote access into garage. Grant sidewalk is in relatively good condition.

Resubmittal fully shows landscape. KK – comfortable with what you are proposing but would like to see you return (48 months) as changes occur in term of reevaluating the Grant Ave. frontage. TS – reasonable request. KK – motion. SW – there is also a tradeoff related to park area. Staff - Streetscape implementation is another topic that would be a good focus for a business meeting. Issues such as continuity and incentives , perhaps a funding mechanism, should be addressed.

Result: Motion to approve. Will return in 48 months with update status concerning the park area's development. (6-0-1) Hardesty recusing.

IV. Recommendation to Art Commission for Placement of Art

The Columbus Art Commission (CC 3115) has statutory authority over the design and placement of all works of art acquired by the city, placed on property owned or leased by the city or within the public right-of-way. The Downtown Commission provides a non-binding recommendation regarding the placement of public art in the Downtown.

Case#2 17-10- 6R

0:26:00

Location : 12 E. Broad sidewalk

Applicant: Charity Newsies Adam Friedman

Owner: City of Columbus (R.O.W. – sidewalk)

Request:

Non-binding recommendation for placement of Charity Newsies statue on the sidewalk in front of 12 E. Broad St.

This is the location where Charity Newsies got its start 110 years ago (1907).

Discussion: AF – history and mission of Charity Newsies given. Artist showed cutout of statue as well as miniature of bronze. The news boy will be facing west on the sidewalk bracketed by an existing low fence so that it will be protected from the street as well as the main pedestrian flow. Questions were raised and answered about the location and security of the statue. Details given of stature. Bronze newspapers will be reflective of that time 110 years ago as well as recent events. It will be a permanent installation, bolted to the sidewalk with four heavy lags. KK – motion to recommend to the Art Commission, DP 2nd.

Result: Motion to approve and forward recommendation to Art Commission. (7-0)

Case#3 17-10-7R

38:40

Location: Convention Center sidewalk (400 N. High St.)**Applicant:** Convention Center**Owner:** City of Columbus (R.O.W. – sidewalk)**Request:**

Non-binding recommendation for art on the glass of COTA bus stop.

While the location of the bus stop has been approved, information concerning the placement of art scrim on the conventional bus stop is being made to the Downtown Commission.

Discussion: Greater Columbus Arts Council collection art will be on the glass. Location has already been determined so this review is more for information purposes as it is for locational recommendation. KK – Motion to recommend, TH – 2nd. The art provided is more of an example than a proposal. JM – questioned whether the art would be solid or translucent. Motion was amended to recommend that the art be translucent, more for security purposes. The art should also be on the interior portion of the glass.

Result: Motion to approve and forward recommendation to Art Commission with comment reflecting the suggestion for translucency (7-0).

V. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness**Case #4 17-10-1**

43:13

Address: 555 W. Goodale Street**Applicant:** WC Goodale LLC**Design Professional :** Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance**Attorney:** Scott Ziance, Vorys**Property Owner:** White Castle Management Co.**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness review and approval for the White Castle Headquarters Building. Project also includes the attached Community Center and parking deck.

The entire White Castle site was conceptually reviewed by the Downtown Commission at their August 2017 meeting.

Discussion: For final approval for Corporate HQ building (100,000sf). BP – 20- acres of redevelopment total site. Phased development. White Castle will move into this new building before developing the rest of the site. The back portion of the existing building will be torn down. The front half will be taken down after the new HQ building is completed. All existing buildings will eventually come down. Will use the existing intersection off of Goodale (light with entrance to NB 315) as primary entrance into the site. There will also be an additional 80,000sf office building. There will also be two park spaces – an amphitheater and a linear space that culminates at the river. The White Castle front façade is designed to encompass the amphitheater. Front elevation and materials presented. 4 story building with sub-basement. Parking garage on the back side. Next to I-670. Materials shown – cast stone, black brick, metal panels, Clear anodized storefront, black anodized. Terra cotta tile hung like a shingle, made in Ohio. Image of the material on a church shown. Variation in color and scale. Will be coming back for signage. JM – suggested that the

future signage refer back to the history of White Castle. BP – the amphitheater area is being looked at to incorporate some of this iconography.

Community center for the development will be part of this building. Two story space with roof garden on top. The White Castle Office will also have a roof deck, both with commanding views of downtown. Amphitheater is intended to help activate the site. TH – nature of internal streets – are they public or private? Some roads will be public – shown, the others private. White Castle has been working with Public Service. DP – How would amphitheater impact the residential development? BP – similar to Columbus Commons. People living here will be aware of their location. Phases of development discussed. The 4th phase will be market driven. Buffer along I-670 with office use. Residential along Olentangy. Major roads and amphitheater with initial building. Will come back with amphitheater details (at next meeting). KK – questions about elevation between I-670 and development – BP I-670 is 19 ft. higher. Community center roof terrace will be 5 to 7 feet higher than I-670. KK – mitigating noise from I-670. BP – part of site. Offices will be insulated (clear glass). Garage will be two stories accessed via on-site slope changes.

What approvals are being asked for? Conceptual site layout, office building and garage (if I don't have the details I can come back). SW – will you come back for landscape? BP – will come back with amphitheater and details on signage, lighting. Signage shown today is for reference only, not approval. JM – questions about garage. How it interacts with building. BP – the garage is settled back into the slope. The 2nd floor of the garage is at the 1st floor of the building. There will be some green area adjacent to the garage. JM – it would be good if you had a section of the garage. BP the garage will be concrete with the cast stone product. SW – come back with garage details and landscaping. KK – motion to approve for building. SW – need to see detail of the roadway(s), amphitheater, parking garage, landscaping around the project. Come back with lighting and signage. BP – minimal lighting on the building is planned. Will bring cut sheet back. ML – 2nd. BP – will be building the office building and garage at basically the same time, but office building will start first.

Result: Motion to approve the HQ office building. Must return with details on the garage, lighting landscaping, roadways and amphitheater. (7-0)

Case #5 17-10-2

Address: 41 S High Street

Applicant and Design Professional: Design Collective, Inc.

Property Owner: Hines

1:07:00

Huntington Center

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for the renovation (rebranding) of Huntington Center, including:

- Street level improvements – removal of one planter, recladding other planters, new benches and new drainage
- Roof top terrace (36th Floor)
- Interior work not under the purview of the Commission

This project was initially review in May 2017 and represents significant revisions.

Discussion: Roof decks are often an administratively approvable item since they are usually not visible from the street. A – team has been expanded since May, including MKSK. Project also includes common area improvements within interior. Includes floor and a half green wall. New business center on 36th floor as well as exterior rooftop terrace. Focus today is on the streetscape project. Under streetscape is concrete roof deck (5 inches in depth) with occupied space underneath that. Limitation that changed the direction of plantings. Threat of water penetration. Removal of

center planter to open sight line to capitol. In 2006 planters were added. Benches will be added to engage the streetscape and activate. MKSK – lighted bollards will be added. There is also a drainage issue that needs to be corrected with trench drain. White facing of planters to be removed and to be replaced with a metal that matches other installed materials. Planting is also similar to what will be done on the roof top, a hint of what is to come. Benches to help create gathering space to make more human. KK – concern about vagrants? – Not with 24 / 7 security. DP – no bus stop in the area. A. – the bus stop is down by the Rife which allows for some stacking. Dark stone bench with stainless steel seating. The existing planters have lighting around the base and will remain. Planting will be predominately grasses; the area will be in shade a lot. TH – don't have concerns as it relates to streetscape stands; a special entrance to a major building. A. – trees are actually cast into the structure below. Monolith signs will not be altered. Signs were approved by the commission in 2015. SW – looking at roof deck 36 stories up is the equivalent to looking at interior. A. – there will be a windscreen wall, setback a little, possibly visible. Commission – don't really need to review roof. KK – move to accept.

Result: Motion to approve. (7-0)

Case #6 17-10-4

1:23:47

Address: 60 E. Broad Street

Applicant: Steve Lenker

Design Professional: Weaver Custom Homes

Property Owner: COR LLC

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for LED message center graphic above entry to 60 E. Broad Street.

Discussion: Lower level façade renovation from the mid-20th Century with Federal bank or savings and loan motif. Large ground sign in sidewalk in front of building also from this era. SL – Will be first office in a downtown location. Great building in terrific condition. Intends to convert 5th floor to residential and use first floor and mezzanine for their offices – title search and insurance. LED will take advantage of showing multiple businesses. LED board would be 5'H x 22'W and 6" cabinet. Color selection matches existing façade materials. Represents about 6.25% of the entire façade. LED is not for advertising but for tenants. KK – who is this being targeted for – it's about 25 feet high. SL – we thought it would add vibrancy to capitol square area, not be so static, but dynamic. KK – How important is this? A. – part of their marketing. Would there be any other signage on building? A. No.

JM – don't know if this adds much to the area, actually it detracts. LED is discouraged, especially at Capitol Square location. DP – what about the existing sign board? A. – our concern there would be that it would obstruct traffic. If it could be more dynamic and less static, we might consider. OB – a lot is going on at the corner of Broad and High. ML – aren't our guidelines that message be restricted to High St. and the Arena District? KK – maybe look for other places on building to communicate the things you want to say – on (in) window. Staff – might be less restrictions if setback in the windows. KK – suggestion to table to investigate ways you can accomplish your goals. JM do something that will not detract from the architecture. A. – I don't know that inside the window would be the optimum place since it would also be the entrance for the residences. How about the monument sign. SW – I think that a nice sign on that would be great. I would vote against the sign as proposed. A. – request to table.

Result: Tabled at request of applicant.

VI. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for Mural (Temporary Graphic)

Case #7 17-10-5M

1:35:48

Columbus Art ad mural

Address: 88 E. Broad Street

Applicant and Design Professional: Lamar Advertising (Jeff Brown, Atty.)

Property Owner: Broad Third Partners LLC (Mike Shannon, Atty.)

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the west elevation of 88 E. Broad Street. Proposed mural – **Columbus Art** . . . CC3359.05(C)1)

This is the first non- administratively approvable site brought to the Commission since the new Council approve legislation went into effect in late March of 2017. Commission approval of this is now based upon appropriate place and size. If approved, this site will be added to the list of administratively approval sites based upon the criteria of % text and logo being under 15%. The U.S. Supreme Court ruling of the Arizona case has affected content based criteria.

An application was made for this site in July 2017 and tabled at the request of the applicant. The design at this time has been significantly altered.

Dimensions of mural: 31'W x 180'H, non-lit

Term of installation: Seeking approval from November 6 through December 31, 2017

Area of mural: 5,580sf

Approximate % of area that is text: 10.5%

Discussion: The art has changed from the application that was made in July of this year. JB – here to activate a location. Commission approved in the past Maker's Mark – 2008. Clips are still on. Determination was made by the Commission that this was an appropriate secondary elevation. Nothing has changed with the building. Neighborhood hasn't changed. Ad murals on the other side across the parking lot and on S. Third St. All perpendicular to the Main St. Same basic situation. Pass out of Lamar photo survey of secondary elevations elsewhere in downtown with ad murals. Working with GCAC with letter of support in terms of activating the area.

Originally ad murals were determined by discussions of content. Design Guidelines in 2013. We believe we comply with those guidelines. 2016 – Supreme Court case when you went content neutral. Standards were revised to reflect this. We comply with percentage of text and all other current criteria. The only thing is that we were not active as of 2013. We came in a couple of months ago with that question of how to reactivate a site. No criteria in the legislation. Limitations as to what the property owner can do. Also equal protection with other buildings with similar secondary façade conditions. Consider, reapprove and reactivate. Staff – discussion with Planning Administrator reversion back to the locational guidelines in the 2013 Guidelines. Location complies with all except the most discretionary item (“area context and character will be part of the review for as mural location”). Capitol Square does have a number of other locations. JB – you did have the opportunity to carve out areas of exclusion or inclusion, but you haven't done so. Doing the new legislation would have been the appropriate time to introduce this. Points out other ad mural locations as well as active LED's in terms of context. Don't know why the site became inactive. Nothing has really changed by your regulations.

OB – putting arts council ad mural seems beneficial to the city as would be something for OSU or Columbus State. But everything after that could be anything. SW – no control over content. We’d be approving a 12-story billboard. JB – if you look at the survey you will find that there are other murals that are tall and narrow. Same sort of situation – look at the Atlas building. JM – I have never felt that this location was appropriate. I consider it a prominent secondary façade. We always had the ability to reinvestigate an approval next time. Now we don’t. SW – initial ad mural program – Harrison Smith – looking for exiting expression. Now we have no control over content. We’ve had a change in the underlining circumstance. We are effectively approving a billboard. We as a city do not want this to happen. JB – contradictory nature of Downtown Commission – it working out or it being arbitrary and capricious. I, my client and the property owner are stuck. SW – I don’t necessarily agree that all criteria are being met. Mike Shannon – representing the owner Jay Schottenstein. Concerns about the content are a slippery slope. The building does have glass curtain walls on three sides and this surface is not one of those three sides. At one point in time the building could be expanded westerly. Mr. Schottenstein is careful about his reputation and properties. OB – I’m concerned that we would be denying them an ad mural location when there had already been one there. A precedence has been set. Staff – there are maybe five dormant sites. OB – use it or lose it. Position that we are afraid of future content puts us in a difficult position. JM – is this location appropriate for any content that can follow? DP – we’re being cautious about this. OB -Does the have the authority to say you can’t put up a mural period? KK – even if it existed before. We wouldn’t be having this discussion if the site had remained active. JB – there is nothing in the 2013 legislation that creates any additional burden as to why this can’t go up at this location. If there is a compromise, we will be willing to shorten the mural, i.e. 30 ft. to 150 ft. Staff – there are already two sets of brackets. JM – we do have the right to evaluate a location. SW – is there a motion to approve? OB – move for approval. ML – 2nd. TH – same size or reduced? JB – agree to reduce by 30 ft. OB – motion for 130 ft. in length. DP – this is a massive area. The proposal is very artsy, shortening it takes away the impact on this specific one.

Result: Motion to approve location, size and mural (3-3-1) Motion fails. Yes – Beatty, Hardesty, Lusk. No – Wittmann, Maniace, Palmore. Recusing – Katz.

VII. Business / Discussion

Update on Motorist Insurance Project’s promenade including interface with Topiary Park. 2:07:55

Particular emphasis on interaction of intended closure and / or easement of Library Park North regarding access to Topiary Park and public access from Ninth St. to Washington Ave. Michael Coleman / Moody Nolan / Edge Group – informal update. Concerns raised by One-stop-shop. Interface with park and adequate clear path for vehicles after promenade has been developed. The northern portion of the R.O.W. would be acquired. Handout.

North side on Oak St. will have more room for planting.

Public Forum

Harrison Smith Award

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last notification (August 18, 2017)

Ad Mural – ***Bold & Italics***

1. ***66 S. Third St. – OrthoOne ad mural***
2. ***56-60 E. Long St. – Apple - ad mural***
3. 74 W. Mound St. – Marathon Oil - move sign
4. ***43 W. Long St. – Apple -ad mural***

5. *285 N Front St. – Apple ad mural*
6. *35 W Spring St. – Marriott – Apple ad mural*
7. *15 W. Cherry St. – Apple ad mural*
8. 355 McConnell Blvd. – ground signs for parking garage
9. 491 Park ST. – Cantina – seasonal tent
10. 100 E. Gay St. – Poke Bros. – window scrim
11. One Riverside – AEP ground level sign changes
12. 255 E. Long St. – Neilston Sign – Edwards
13. 333 W. Broad St. – COSI sign on building
14. 66 E. Mound St. – Lights and Access gates – Franklin Co. surface lot
15. 36 W. Gay St. – revisions to improvements – door to window
16. 89 E. Nationwide Blvd. – Jeff Ruby's – signage, canopy / awnings

Next regular meeting will be on November 21, 2017, the third Tuesday of the month (four weeks away).

If you have questions concerning these results, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 614-645-8404.

2:27:01